

1 Howard Holderness, CA Bar No. 169814
 2 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
 3 1 Market Street, Spear Tower, 25th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94105
 (415) 442-1000 (Telephone)
 (415) 442-1001 (Facsimile)

4 Charles L. Babcock, IV, TX Bar No. 01479500
 5 JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.
 6 1401 McKinney, Suite 1900
 Houston, Texas 77010
 Admitted Pro Hac Vice
 7 (713) 752-4200
 (713) 752-4221

8

9 George L. McWilliams
 10 LAW OFFICE OF GEORGE L. MCWILLIAMS, P.C.
 TX Bar No. 13877000; AR Bar No. 68078
 11 406 Walnut, P.O. Box 58
 Texarkana, ARK-TX 75504-0058
 Admitted Pro Hac Vice
 12 (903) 277-0098 (Telephone)
 (870) 773-2967 (Facsimile)

13

14 Attorneys for Movant
 RICHARD FRENKEL

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17 ILLINOIS COMPUTER RESEARCH, LLC,
 Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant,

Miscellaneous Action No.
 CV 5:08-mc-80075-JF (HRL)

18 vs.

**RICHARD FRENKEL'S MOTION
 FOR LEAVE TO SUBMIT
 SUPPLEMENTAL
 DECLARATIONS IN SUPPORT OF
 MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA
 AND FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

19 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.,
 20 Defendant, Counterclaimant and Third
 Party Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 SCOTT C. HARRIS,
 23 Third-Party Defendant and
 Counterclaimant

Hon. Magistrate Judge Howard Lloyd

24 vs.

25 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.,
 26 Defendant, Counterclaimant, Third
 Party Plaintiff and Counterclaim
 27 Defendant

28

RICHARD FRENKEL'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUBMIT
 SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATIONS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
 QUASH SUBPOENA AND FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Richard Frenkel (“Frenkel”), a non-party to the underlying case,¹ respectfully requests leave to submit Supplemental Declarations of Richard Frenkel and Charles L. Babcock in Support of Motion to Quash Subpoena and for Protective Order, attached as Exhibit “A” and “B” to Babcock’s Declaration. Frenkel will suffer prejudice if he does not have an opportunity to respond to certain false allegations made against him by Illinois Computer Research LLC (“ICR”) and Scott C. Harris (“Harris”) (collectively, “Issuers”) for the first time in Issuers’ Response to Frenkel’s and Cisco’s Motion to Quash ICR’s Subpoena for Documents and Testimony (“Response”) (N.D. Cal. Case 5:08-mc-80075-JF-HRL, docket no. 21). Accordingly, Frenkel seeks leave to correct and clarify the factual record, as Issuers have made numerous false claims that go to the heart of whether this Court should enforce their subpoena against Frenkel.

Frenkel’s and Babcock’s Supplemental Declarations respond to and refute the factually incorrect assumptions Issuers rely on to support their subpoena, including the allegations that “Frenkel had (and evidently still has) close ties with Fish, its head of litigation, Kathi Lutton, with John Steele and with now-dismissed defendant Google’s Head of Patent and Patent Strategy, Michelle Lee” (he did not and does not); and that “the four of them were on the faculty of the Advanced Patent Law Institute” (true, but so were many others, and neither Lutton, Steele, nor Lee were on Frenkel’s panel); and that he “appeared together [with Lutton and another Fish attorney, John Dragseth] on a May 30, 2007 webinar” (true, but he never discussed ICR, Harris, or the Chicago case with anyone at Fish, including Lutton and Dragseth); and that he was involved in a patent lawsuit in which “Fish (and

¹ *Illinois Computer Research LLC v. Fish & Richardson, P.C.*, pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, Case No. 07 C 5081 (“the Chicago case”).

1 Lutton specifically) represented Cisco" (true, Frenkel is not directly involved in that
2 litigation although a lawyer he supervises is, and in any event, he never discussed Issuers or
3 the Chicago case with anyone at Fish); and that "Frenkel ... targeted Scott Harris, his
4 lawyers and owners of the Harris patents in an effort to diminish the value of his patents, to
5 discourage their enforcement and to force an assignment of the patent to Fish" (he did not),
6 Response pp. 23-24. Frenkel Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 2-14. Moreover, Issuers falsely claim that
7 Frenkel has not "seriously challenge[d] the relevance of the discovery ICR [and Harris]
8 seeks [sic]" (he has, as evidenced in his Opposition to Issuers' (now-withdrawn) Motion to
9 Compel, attached as Exhibit "A" to Babcock's Supplemental Declaration), Response p. 23.
10 Babcock Supp. Decl. Ex. A.

11 Based on these and other untrue "facts," Issuers want Frenkel to produce documents
12 and testify at a deposition so that they can determine whether "Fish or Google used Frenkel
13 as a vehicle to aid or assist in the tortious interference with ICR's and Harris' licensing and
14 enforcement of the Harris patents or in defaming Harris" (Frenkel had no involvement in
15 such alleged interference or defamation nor did Fish or Google use him as "a vehicle" to do
16 anything), Response p. 24. Frenkel Supp. Decl. ¶¶ 13.

17 When Frenkel filed his Motion to Quash and for Protective Order on April 7, 2008,
18 he did not know why Issuers believed Frenkel possessed any knowledge or documents that
19 were relevant to or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in
20 the Chicago case. Now that Issuers have attempted to elucidate some connection between
21 Frenkel and the parties and purported facts at issue in the Chicago case – first articulated in
22 their Motion to Compel filed on April 7, 2008 (N.D. Cal. Case 5:08-mc-80074-JF-HRL,
23 docket no. 1) (since withdrawn) and now repeated and propped up by additional "facts" in
24 their Response – it is clear that there simply is no connection.
25
26
27
28

1 It is no wonder, then, that Issuers take the position in their Response that it would
2 be improper for Frenkel to submit new evidence in reply to their Response. Response pp.
3 9-10. But without an opportunity to respond to these false claims, Frenkel will suffer
4 substantial harm and this Court will not have a full factual record on which to determine
5 whether to quash the subpoena. The Court's Civil Local Rule 7-3(c), which governs reply
6 briefs, allows Frenkel to include "affidavits and declarations" with his reply. N.D. Cal.
7 Civil L.R. 7-3(c) ("Any reply to an opposition must be served and filed by the moving
8 party not less than 14 days before the hearing date. *The reply may include affidavits or*
9 *declarations*, as well as a supplemental brief or memorandum under Civil L.R. 7-4. . . .")
10 (emphasis added). Further, the Court has discretion whether to consider new evidence
11 presented in support of a reply brief as long as the Court gives the opposing party an
12 opportunity to respond, a response Frenkel welcomes. *See Miller v. Glenn Miller*
13 *Productions, Inc.*, 454 F.3d 975, 979 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that the district court did not
14 err in considering evidence attached to reply brief because if the opposing party "desired
15 to respond to the new material, it could have asked the district court for permission to do
16 so"); *El Pollo Loco, Inc. v. Hashim*, 316 F.3d 1032, 1040-1041 (9th Cir. 2003) (holding
17 that district court did not abuse discretion when it considered matters raised for the first
18 time in reply brief); *Provenz v. Miller*, 102 F.3d 1478, 1483 (9th Cir. 1996); *Daghlian v.*
19 *DeVry University, Inc.*, 461 F. Supp. 2d 1121, 1144 (C.D. Cal. 2006). Accordingly, this
20 Court should grant Frenkel leave to submit his and Babcock's Supplemental Declarations.
21
22 Wherefore, premises considered, Richard Frenkel respectfully requests that the Court
23 grant leave to allow him to submit the Supplemental Declarations of Richard Frenkel and
24 Charles L. Babcock in Support of Motion to Quash Subpoena and for Protective Order.
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4 Dated: April 29, 2008

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

5 By /s/ Howard Holderness
6 Howard Holderness

7 Attorneys for Movant
8 RICHARD FRENKEL

9 Dated: April 29, 2008

JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.

10 By /s/ Charles L. Babcock
11 Charles L. Babcock

12 Attorneys for Movant
13 RICHARD FRENKEL

14 Dated: April 29, 2008

LAW OFFICE OF GEORGE L. MCWILLIAMS,
15 P.C.

16 By /s/ George L. McWilliams
George L. McWilliams

17 Attorneys for Movant
18 RICHARD FRENKEL

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28